1	wo
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
8	
9	Benjamin Robert Taylor,) No. CV 08-139-PHX-JAT
10	Plaintiff, ORDER
11	vs.
12	State of Arizona; et al,
13	Defendants.
14	
15	
16	On June 18, 2009, the Magistrate Judge ordered Plaintiff to show cause why certain
17	unserved defendants should not be dismissed. (Doc. #50). Plaintiff responded and consented
18	to the dismissal of those defendants. (Doc. #51). Accordingly, on July 17, 2009, the
19	Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") (Doc. #54) recommending
20	that those defendants be dismissed.
21	Neither party has filed objections to the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby accepts
22	the R&R. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (finding that district courts are not
23	required to conduct "any review at all of any issue that is not the subject of an objection"
24	(emphasis added)); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en
25	banc) ("statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge's
26	findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise" (emphasis
27	in original)); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F.Supp.2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003).
28	Accordingly,

1	IT IS ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc.
2	#54) is ACCEPTED ; and
3	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the following Defendants are dismissed, without
4	prejudice:
5	Robert Stewart
6	Jane Doe Stewart
7	John Doe Struebeck
8	Jane Doe Struebeck
9	John Doe Long
10	Jane Doe Long
11	John Doe Love
12	Jane Doe Love
13	John Doe Lewis
14	Jane Doe Lewis
15	John Doe Munz
16	Jane Doe Munz
17	John Doe Grabowski
18	Jane Doe Grabowski
19	John Does and Jane Does I-X.
20	DATED this 10 th day of August, 2009.
21	
22	() (Lillow
23	James A. Teilborg / United States District Judge
24	Officed States District Judge
25	
26	
27	

28